

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Case:**

The parent of the subject reissue application (“the Parent Application,” Serial No. 10/141,374) was filed on May 8, 2002, as a reissue of U.S. Patent 6,168,626. The application was filed with a preliminary amendment, presenting a total of 273 claims, including the originally issued and unamended Claims 1 – 11 of the ‘626 Patent. A Notice under 37 C.F.R. 1.607(c) was filed with the Preliminary Amendment, stating that the reissue application presents new claims defining subject matter claimed in U.S. Patent 6,228,900, Shen et al., issued May 8, 2001.

An Office Action was issued in the Parent Application on August 13, 2003, setting forth a restriction requirement that defined twelve allegedly distinct groups of claims. Because Group I of the restriction consists of the claims of the ‘626 Patent, that group was deemed elected for examination in the Parent Application.

Applicants will traverse the restriction requirement in the Parent Application. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the entire scope of claims of interest to the Applicants, this divisional is filed re-presenting Claims 12 – 136. Filing of this divisional does not constitute an admission that restriction in the Parent Application is proper. Applicants reserve the right to re-present claims that were presented in the Parent Application but that are not included in this Preliminary Amendment.

The claims presented in this divisional are identical to Claims 12 – 136 presented in the Parent Application, as filed on May 8, 2002, with minor amendments that were made to Claims 29, 30, and 101, in a Supplemental Amendment filed February 21, 2003. These claims correspond to Groups II – V of the restriction requirement.

Description Of Claim Support Pursuant To 37 C.F.R. 1.173(c):

An Appendix is attached providing an explanation of support for Claims 12-136. The Appendix provides tables showing non-limiting examples of support in the specification for each term or phrase in each claim. Support for these claims may also be found elsewhere in the specification, as would be understood by one of skill in the art. Support for terms in a dependent claim is not provided if the terms are included in a claim upon which the claim depends. Applicants submit that Claims 12-136 are fully supported by the specification, and are patentable.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 13, 2003  
19 MAF

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

By:

Mark A. Frentrup  
David L. Suter, Reg. No. 30,692  
Mark A. Frentrup, Reg. No. 41,026